

ORIGINAL

1 SCHIFF HARDIN LLP
 2 Bruce A. Wagman, Esq. (CSB #159987)
 3 bwagman@schiffhardin.com
 4 One Market, Spear Street Tower
 5 Thirty-Second Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94105
 Telephone: (415) 901-8700
 Facsimile: (415) 901-8701

898
 6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

99
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 8010
 8011
 8012
 8013
 8014
 8015
 8016
 8017
 8018
 8019
 8020
 8021
 8022
 8023
 8024
 8025
 8026
 8027
 8028
 8029
 8030
 8031
 8032
 8033
 8034
 8035
 8036
 8037
 8038
 8039
 8040
 8041
 8042
 8043
 8044
 8045
 8046
 8047
 8048
 8049
 8050
 8051
 8052
 8053
 8054
 8055
 8056
 8057
 8058
 8059
 8060
 8061
 8062
 8063
 8064
 8065
 8066
 8067
 8068
 8069
 8070
 8071
 8072
 8073
 8074
 8075
 8076
 8077
 8078
 8079
 8080
 8081
 8082
 8083
 8084
 8085
 8086
 8087
 8088
 8089
 8090
 8091
 8092
 8093
 8094
 8095
 8096
 8097
 8098
 8099
 80100
 80101
 80102
 80103
 80104
 80105
 80106
 80107
 80108
 80109
 80110
 80111
 80112
 80113
 80114
 80115
 80116
 80117
 80118
 80119
 80120
 80121
 80122
 80123
 80124
 80125
 80126
 80127
 80128
 80129
 80130
 80131
 80132
 80133
 80134
 80135
 80136
 80137
 80138
 80139
 80140
 80141
 80142
 80143
 80144
 80145
 80146
 80147
 80148
 80149
 80150
 80151
 80152
 80153
 80154
 80155
 80156
 80157
 80158
 80159
 80160
 80161
 80162
 80163
 80164
 80165
 80166
 80167
 80168
 80169
 80170
 80171
 80172
 80173
 80174
 80175
 80176
 80177
 80178
 80179
 80180
 80181
 80182
 80183
 80184
 80185
 80186
 80187
 80188
 80189
 80190
 80191
 80192
 80193
 80194
 80195
 80196
 80197
 80198
 80199
 80200
 80201
 80202
 80203
 80204
 80205
 80206
 80207
 80208
 80209
 80210
 80211
 80212
 80213
 80214
 80215
 80216
 80217
 80218
 80219
 80220
 80221
 80222
 80223
 80224
 80225
 80226
 80227
 80228
 80229
 80230
 80231
 80232
 80233
 80234
 80235
 80236
 80237
 80238
 80239
 80240
 80241
 80242
 80243
 80244
 80245
 80246
 80247
 80248
 80249
 80250
 80251
 80252
 80253
 80254
 80255
 80256
 80257
 80258
 80259
 80260
 80261
 80262
 80263
 80264
 80265
 80266
 80267
 80268
 80269
 80270
 80271
 80272
 80273
 80274
 80275
 80276
 80277
 80278
 80279
 80280
 80281
 80282
 80283
 80284
 80285
 80286
 80287
 80288
 80289
 80290
 80291
 80292
 80293
 80294
 80295
 80296
 80297
 80298
 80299
 80300
 80301
 80302
 80303
 80304
 80305
 80306
 80307
 80308
 80309
 80310
 80311
 80312
 80313
 80314
 80315
 80316
 80317
 80318
 80319
 80320
 80321
 80322
 80323
 80324
 80325
 80326
 80327
 80328
 80329
 80330
 80331
 80332
 80333
 80334
 80335
 80336
 80337
 80338
 80339
 80340
 80341
 80342
 80343
 80344
 80345
 80346
 80347
 80348
 80349
 80350
 80351
 80352
 80353
 80354
 80355
 80356
 80357
 80358
 80359
 80360
 80361
 80362
 80363
 80364
 80365
 80366
 80367
 80368
 80369
 80370
 80371
 80372
 80373
 80374
 80375
 80376
 80377
 80378
 80379
 80380
 80381
 80382
 80383
 80384
 80385
 80386
 80387
 80388
 80389
 80390
 80391
 80392
 80393
 80394
 80395
 80396
 80397
 80398
 80399
 80400
 80401
 80402
 80403
 80404
 80405
 80406
 80407
 80408
 80409
 80410
 80411
 80412
 80413
 80414
 80415
 80416
 80417
 80418
 80419
 80420
 80421
 80422
 80423
 80424
 80425
 80426
 80427
 80428
 80429
 80430
 80431
 80432
 80433
 80434
 80435
 80436
 80437
 80438
 80439
 80440
 80441
 80442
 80443
 80444
 80445
 80446
 80447
 80448
 80449
 80450
 80451
 80452
 80453
 80454
 80455
 80456
 80457
 80458
 80459
 80460
 80461
 80462
 80463
 80464
 80465
 80466
 80467
 80468
 80469
 80470
 80471
 80472
 80473
 80474
 80475
 80476
 80477
 80478
 80479
 80480
 80481
 80482
 80483
 80484
 80485
 80486
 80487
 80488
 80489
 80490
 80491
 80492
 80493
 80494
 80495
 80496
 80497
 80498
 80499
 80500
 80501
 80502
 80503
 80504
 80505
 80506
 80507
 80508
 80509
 80510
 80511
 80512
 80513
 80514
 80515
 80516
 80517
 80518
 80519
 80520
 80521
 80522
 80523
 80524
 80525
 80526
 80527
 80528
 80529
 80530
 80531
 80532
 80533
 80534
 80535
 80536
 80537
 80538
 80539
 80540
 80541
 80542
 80543
 80544
 80545
 80546
 80547
 80548
 80549
 80550
 80551
 80552
 80553
 80554
 80555
 80556
 80557
 80558
 80559
 80560
 80561
 80562
 80563
 80564
 80565
 80566
 80567
 80568
 80569
 80570
 80571
 80572
 80573
 80574
 80575
 80576
 80577
 80578
 80579
 80580
 80581
 80582
 80583
 80584
 80585
 80586
 80587
 80588
 80589
 80590
 80591
 80592
 80593
 80594
 80595
 80596
 80597
 80598
 80599
 80600
 80601
 80602
 80603
 80604
 80605
 80606
 80607
 80608
 80609
 80610
 80611
 80612
 80613
 80614
 80615
 80616
 80617
 80618
 80619
 80620
 80621
 80622
 80623
 80624
 80625
 80626

1 Secretary of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture (“USDA”), Elizabeth A.
 2 Hagen, USDA Under Secretary for Food Safety, and Alfred V. Almanza, USDA Administrator
 3 for Food Safety and Inspection Service (“FSIS”), collectively “Defendants,” for violation of the
 4 National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.* (“NEPA”) and the Administrative
 5 Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 706(2)(A), (C), and (D).

6 2. Defendants are embarking on a nationwide program of horse slaughter that
 7 presents clear threats to the environment without complying with Congressionally-mandated
 8 requirements intended to protect the public and our natural resources.

9 3. The slaughter of American horses for human consumption presents unique and
 10 extensive dangers that have never been adequately considered by Defendants, despite their
 11 obligations under NEPA.

12 4. In 2007, Congress ended horse slaughter for human consumption in America, and
 13 there has been no program or policy for inspection of horse slaughter facilities in place since that
 14 time. In 2011, Congress appropriated funding for inspection of horse slaughter facilities, which
 15 necessitated a new set of plans, policies, and procedures for inspection of horse slaughter
 16 facilities by FSIS.

17 5. For six years, from 2007 until the filing of this complaint, there has been no plan
 18 or policy for inspection of horses going to slaughter. For that entire time, horses were notably
 19 absent from any consideration of testing or inspection programs. Defendants have been
 20 modifying and supposedly improving their testing programs for slaughtered animals over the
 21 course of that time. But horses have been consistently excluded. Even USDA’s 2013 National
 22 Residue Program for testing animals subject to slaughter, when the agency knew that horse
 23 slaughter was authorized, excluded horses from consideration.

24 6. Plaintiffs are filing this action because Defendants are proceeding with the
 25 inspection of horses under the Federal Meat Inspection Act without compliance with their
 26 federally mandated environmental review obligations. The issue of Defendants’ failure to comply
 27 with NEPA with respect to their horse slaughter inspection activities was previously addressed in
 28

1 *Humane Soc. of U.S. v. Johanns*, 520 F. Supp. 2d 8, 36 (D.D.C. 2007), and resulted in a final
 2 order finding defendants in violation of NEPA.

3 7. At least six applications for horse slaughter inspections in five states have already
 4 been submitted to USDA since Congress appropriated funding for inspections. These
 5 applications include: Valley Meat Co. LLC (“Valley Meat”) located in Roswell, New Mexico;
 6 Responsible Transportation of Sigourney, Iowa; Rains Natural Meats of Gallatin, Missouri;
 7 American Beef Company/Unified Equine, LLC (“Unified Equine”) of Rockville, Missouri; Trail
 8 South Meat Processing Co. (“Trail South”) of Woodbury, Tennessee; and Oklahoma Meat
 9 Company of Washington, Oklahoma. In light of these applications, Defendants have been
 10 developing new plans and programs, and a new set of policies with respect to the inspection of
 11 horse slaughter facilities.

12 8. As set forth in this Complaint, Defendants have violated NEPA by failing to
 13 prepare an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment prior to granting
 14 inspection to horse slaughter plants located throughout the United States. Defendants’ challenged
 15 actions authorize the resumption of slaughter of American horses for human consumption after
 16 six years without domestic horse slaughter. Defendants have taken this action notwithstanding
 17 USDA’s obligations to comply with NEPA, and USDA’s actual knowledge that horse slaughter
 18 causes significant environmental harms related specifically to the means and methods of horse
 19 slaughter, the potentially toxic nature of the waste generated by this industry, and the fact that
 20 horse meat endangers consumers.

21 9. Additionally, Defendants have violated NEPA by failing to prepare an
 22 environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment prior to adopting and
 23 implementing a new residue testing plan applicable to all horse slaughter plants throughout the
 24 nation that may be authorized to operate by Defendants.

25 10. Defendants’ failure to conduct any consideration or review of the environmental
 26 effects of their grant of inspection and their new residue testing plan violates NEPA and its
 27 implementing regulations. Defendants should be enjoined from: carrying out inspections at any
 28 horse slaughter facility that has received a grant of inspection; implementing their new residue

1 testing plan for any horse slaughter facility; and granting inspection to any horse slaughter
 2 facility, unless and until Defendants conduct a detailed review of the environmental effects of
 3 their actions in full compliance with NEPA and its implementing regulations.

4 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5 11. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Venue
 6 is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e).

7 **III. PARTIES**

8 12. Front Range Equine Rescue (FRER) is a Colorado-based nonprofit group
 9 incorporated under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. FRER has over 95,000
 10 supporters nationwide, with its largest percentage in California, and is dedicated to stopping
 11 cruelty and abuse of horses through rescue and education. FRER is actively involved in the
 12 rescue, rehabilitation and adoption to good homes of domestic and wild horses found at auctions
 13 and horses destined for slaughter; and in educational efforts regarding responsible horse
 14 ownership, the cruelty of horse slaughter and wild horse roundups. FRER has assisted thousands
 15 of horses through its rescue and educational programs. While some of FRER's horses are
 16 surrendered by their owners or rescued when abandoned, many are rescued from livestock
 17 auctions; others are purchased at feed lots before they are sent to slaughter.

18 13. FRER has been actively advocating against horse slaughter operations in the
 19 United States for years. In March 2012, FRER, in conjunction with The Humane Society of the
 20 United States, submitted a Petition for Rulemaking to the Federal Food and Drug Administration
 21 ("FDA") requesting that the FDA promulgate rules that horse meat is adulterated according to
 22 federal law and regulations and cannot be sold legally.¹ In April 2012, FRER, in conjunction
 23 with The Humane Society of the United States ("The HSUS"), submitted another Petition for
 24 Rulemaking to the USDA, asking that the USDA promulgate rules that horse meat is adulterated
 25 according to federal law and regulations and cannot be sold legally.² FRER has also petitioned

26
 27 ¹ Available at <http://www.frontrangeequinerescue.org/documents/petition.fda.slaughter.pdf>.
 28 ² Available at http://www.fsis.usda.gov/PDF/Petition_SchiffHardin_040612.pdf.

1 the Federal Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to stop the sale of wild horses gathered from the
 2 range to individuals who then sell them to slaughter facilities.³

3 14. In addition to its petitions to the FDA and USDA for rulemaking regarding
 4 adulterated horse meat and to the BLM regarding wild horses sold for slaughter, FRER has been
 5 instrumental in bringing to light Valley Meat's numerous, blatant violations of New Mexico
 6 environmental law caused by the plant's now-abandoned cattle slaughter operations. Valley
 7 Meat's environmental law violations persisted for many years before FRER advocated that state
 8 officials take action against Valley Meat. FRER wrote multiple letters to the Solid Waste Bureau
 9 of the New Mexico Environmental Department, requesting appropriate sanctions for the
 10 violations perpetrated by Valley Meat. The result of FRER's advocacy was a finding by the Solid
 11 Waste Bureau of the New Mexico Environmental Department in August 2012 that Valley Meat
 12 was in grave violation of the solid waste laws, and that it should be fined \$86,400.

13 15. FRER's primary mission is to stop the abuse and neglect of horses through rescue
 14 and education. It provides support and rehabilitation of horses who are sold at auctions,
 15 purchased from kill buyers, or owner surrendered. The majority of FRER's rescue horses would
 16 have been sent to slaughter but for FRER's rescue of them. Since 2011, however, FRER has been
 17 forced to expend a large portion of its annual budget in an effort to prevent the slaughter of
 18 American horses. The actions of the USDA in delaying consideration of FRER's rulemaking
 19 petition increased the financial outlay FRER had to make in order to identify the nature and
 20 likelihood of success of the current applications for horse slaughter. When USDA announced that
 21 it was going to begin reviewing applications of potential slaughter facilities, FRER was again
 22 required to increase its outlay of funds to investigate and identify the problems with horse
 23 slaughter in particular states, nationally, and even internationally. FRER will need to continue to
 24 divert resources from its other programs in order to address the issues surrounding horse slaughter
 25 unless Defendants' actions are stopped.

26
 27

³ Available at <http://www.frontrangeequinerescue.org/documents/wild.horse.filing.dec2012.pdf>.
 28

1 16. Defendants' actions as set forth below impede FRER's actions and frustrate
 2 FRER's ability to pursue its goals for several reasons. First, Defendants' actions will authorize
 3 the slaughter of tens if not hundreds of thousands of healthy American horses. Second, FRER
 4 will continue to be forced to divert its limited resources to investigation of the potential for new
 5 horse slaughterhouses, and the trade in horses in the slaughter pipeline. Defendants' actions will
 6 force FRER to divert its limited organizational and programmatic resources to continue these
 7 investigations and care for animals saved from the slaughterhouse. These resources
 8 would otherwise be spent on programmatic and advocacy activities to prevent cruelty to horses,
 9 in furtherance of FRER's larger goals, including its programs which provide alternatives to horse
 10 slaughter.

11 17. If horse slaughter for human consumption begins in America, FRER and its
 12 supporters will be directly and irreparably harmed. They have a particularized interest in
 13 preventing horse slaughter and have invested significant energy and resources, including a large
 14 portion of FRER's annual budget, into preventing the initiation of the slaughter of American
 15 horses for human food. If this practice begins again, the impact to the organization will be major.

16 18. The interests of FRER and its supporters in observing and enjoying horses, and
 17 otherwise protecting these animals from slaughter, are injured by Defendants' decision to grant
 18 inspection to a horse slaughter plant, because the grant of inspection allows the applicant to begin
 19 slaughtering wild and companion horses. Moreover, FRER has thousands of supporters
 20 nationwide, including in New Mexico, Missouri, Iowa and California. Thousands of FRER's
 21 supporters will be adversely affected by the health, environmental, aesthetic, and economic
 22 impacts of horse slaughter operations.

23 19. These injuries are caused by the USDA's grant of inspection to domestic horse
 24 slaughter plants and adoption of a new residue testing plan for horse slaughter, because if the
 25 grant of inspection had not been given and the new testing program had not been adopted, horses
 26 would not and legally could not be slaughtered for human consumption in America.

27 20. These injuries will be redressed if the Plaintiffs prevail in this action, because if
 28 the grant of inspection is set aside, then any horse slaughter plants that have received grants for

1 inspection will be prohibited from operating, the current status quo of no horse slaughter in the
 2 United States will continue, and there will be no detrimental health, environmental, aesthetic, or
 3 economic impacts felt by the supporters of FRER living in New Mexico, Missouri, and Iowa, or
 4 anywhere else horse slaughter may begin.

5 21. The Humane Society of the United States is a non-profit organization that
 6 promotes the protection of all animals. The HSUS maintains its headquarters in Washington, DC
 7 and is the largest animal protection organization in the United States, with millions of members
 8 nationwide and many thousands of members in New Mexico, Missouri, Iowa and California. The
 9 HSUS has actively advocated against practices that injure or abuse horses and opposes the
 10 slaughter of horses for human consumption for more than fifty years. The HSUS investigates
 11 horse cruelty complaints and assists individuals with guidance and advice as to how to best care
 12 for their horses, including how to prevent horses from being lost, stolen, or sold to "killer buyers"
 13 at auction – middlemen hired by the slaughterhouses to purchase horses for human food. The
 14 HSUS actively collaborates with federal agencies to develop wild horse immunocontraception
 15 field studies and trials, in order to reduce the sale and slaughter of wild horses. The HSUS has
 16 also been active in strengthening provisions of the Horse Protection Act through strong advocacy
 17 in support of the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act (H.R. 503 and S. 1915) since its
 18 original introduction in 2002, and the Wild Horse Act that was introduced this Congress (H.R.
 19 297 and S. 576). The HSUS has assisted in the passage of state laws that ban horse slaughter or
 20 govern the treatment and transportation of horses sold for slaughter within their borders. The
 21 HSUS also advocated for the Commercial Transportation of Equines for Slaughter Act, passed by
 22 Congress in 1996. The HSUS worked with bipartisan leaders in Congress to pass an Amendment
 23 to the FY2006 Agriculture Appropriations Act to de-fund federal ante-mortem inspection of
 24 horses for slaughter. More recently, The HSUS has worked with FRER to submit rulemaking
 25 petitions to FDA and USDA with the purpose of preventing horse slaughter from resuming again
 26 in the United States.

27 22. Members of The HSUS enjoy observing, photographing, studying and otherwise
 28 appreciating wild horses. Members of The HSUS also enjoy observing, photographing, and

1 otherwise appreciating companion horses. The interests of The HSUS and its members in
 2 observing, studying, and enjoying horses, and otherwise protecting these animals from slaughter,
 3 are injured by Defendants' decision to grant inspection to any horse slaughter plant, because the
 4 grant of inspection allows the applicant to begin slaughtering wild and companion horses.
 5 Moreover, members of The HSUS who reside in or near any horse slaughter plants approved by
 6 Defendants will be adversely affected by the health, environmental, aesthetic, and economic
 7 impacts of horse slaughter operations.

8 23. HSUS member Lawrence Seper became a member of The HSUS so that it would
 9 represent his interests on animal protection issues, including the slaughtering of horses for human
 10 consumption. Mr. Seper has lived in Gallatin, Missouri for nearly four years, and lives in close
 11 proximity to the Rains Natural Meats plant. He recreates in the Gallatin area, and would be
 12 injured if Rains Natural Meats begins horse slaughter operations.

13 24. HSUS member Margaret Walker became a member of The HSUS so that it would
 14 represent her interests on animal protection issues, including the slaughtering of horses for human
 15 consumption. Ms. Walker has lived in Gallatin, Missouri for over eight years. Ms. Walker has
 16 an ardent interest in the protection and welfare of horses as companion animals, and would face
 17 an immediate and severe impact to her ability to enjoy her life in Gallatin if Rains Natural Meats
 18 begins slaughtering horses for human consumption.

19 25. HSUS member Barbara Mohror became a member of The HSUS so that it would
 20 represent her interests on animal protection issues, including the slaughtering of horses for human
 21 consumption. Ms. Mohror has lived in Keota, Iowa for more than eighteen years. Ms. Mohror
 22 recreates with her family in the Sigourney area, and will be injured if Responsible Transportation
 23 begins horse slaughter operations.

24 26. These injuries are caused by the USDA's grant of inspection to horse slaughter
 25 facilities and adoption of a new residue testing plan for horse slaughter, because if the grant of
 26 inspection had not been given and a new testing program had not been adopted, horses would not
 27 and legally could not be slaughtered for human consumption in America.

28

1 27. These injuries will be redressed if the Plaintiffs prevail in this action, because if
 2 the grant of inspection is set aside, then the horse slaughter plants will be prohibited from
 3 operating, the current status quo of no horse slaughter in the United States will continue, and
 4 there will be no detrimental health, environmental, aesthetic, or economic impacts felt by
 5 members of The HSUS in New Mexico, Missouri, and Iowa, or anywhere else horse slaughter
 6 may begin.

7 28. Additionally, the ability of The HSUS and its members to engage in educational,
 8 legislative, and advocacy activities with respect to horse protection is injured by Defendants'
 9 failure to comply with NEPA. Without the required environmental analysis, and response to
 10 public comments, Defendants have prevented The HSUS from learning what, if any,
 11 environmental effects information USDA considered prior to USDA undertaking that action,
 12 thereby inhibiting The HSUS's efforts to communicate with its members, so that its members
 13 may in turn contact USDA, other agencies, and their elected representatives to advocate for the
 14 humane treatment of horses and other animals and the protection of the environment from horse
 15 slaughter contamination. These injuries will be redressed if the Plaintiffs prevail in this action,
 16 because when the grant of inspection is set aside, then horse slaughter cannot occur until proper
 17 NEPA review, including public participation and comment, is undertaken.

18 29. Plaintiff Marin Humane Society (MHS) is a nonprofit organization located in
 19 Novato, California. MHS was founded over 100 years ago to protect and advocate for animals.
 20 MHS offers refuge, rehabilitation, and support services to more than 10,000 animals each year,
 21 including domestic, wild, and rescued farm animals. MHS engages in a number of community
 22 services and has actively been involved in the provision of sanctuary and then adoption for
 23 hundreds of animals used in agricultural production or destined for slaughter.

24 30. MHS also has an active anticruelty and advocacy program and routinely supports
 25 legislation directed at reducing cruelty to all animals. MHS has supported and continues to
 26 support the passage of laws banning horse slaughter, based on MHS policy against that practice.

27 31. MHS monitors and weighs in on national issues and has a special focus on Marin
 28 County and its residents. MHS investigates horse cruelty complaints and assists individuals with

1 guidance and advice as to how to best care for their horses, including how to prevent horses from
 2 being lost, stolen, or sold to “killer buyers” at auction – middlemen hired by the slaughterhouses
 3 to purchase horses for human food.

4 32. MHS has actively supported the passage of state laws that ban horse slaughter or
 5 govern the treatment and transportation of horses sold for slaughter. MHS promotes and supports
 6 a mission of anticruelty for all animals, and for that reason is opposed to the slaughter of horses.

7 33. MHS has been actively involved in surveillance and investigations of local
 8 livestock auctions where horses were being sold to killer-buyers for slaughter. MHS has also
 9 rescued horses destined for slaughter, and has counseled the public in order to prevent the sale of
 10 horses to slaughter, and has worked with other equine rescue groups in order to prevent horses
 11 from going to slaughter.

12 34. MHS has been involved in training animal control officers, animal services
 13 officers, and humane officers and other students in the application of state statutes addressing
 14 horse slaughter issues.

15 35. MHS supporters enjoy observing, photographing, studying and otherwise
 16 appreciating companion horses. The interests of MHS and its supporters in observing, studying,
 17 and enjoying horses, and otherwise protecting these animals from slaughter, are injured by
 18 Defendants’ decision to grant inspection to any horse slaughter plant, because the grant of
 19 inspection allows the applicant to begin slaughtering horses.

20 36. These injuries are caused by the USDA’s grant of inspection to horse slaughter
 21 facilities and adoption of a new residue testing plan for horse slaughter, because if the grant of
 22 inspection had not been given and a new testing program had not been adopted, horses would not
 23 and legally could not be slaughtered for human consumption in America.

24 37. These injuries will be redressed if the Plaintiffs prevail in this action, because if
 25 the grant of inspection is set aside, then the horse slaughter plants will be prohibited from
 26 operating, the current status quo of no horse slaughter in the United States will continue, and
 27 there will be no injuries felt by MHS and its supporters.

28

1 38. Additionally, the ability of MHS to engage in educational, legislative, and
 2 advocacy activities with respect to horse protection is injured by Defendants' failure to comply
 3 with NEPA. Without the required environmental analysis, and response to public comments,
 4 Defendants have prevented MHS from learning what, if any, environmental effects information
 5 USDA considered prior to USDA undertaking that action, thereby inhibiting MHS' efforts to
 6 communicate with its supporters, so that they may in turn contact USDA, other agencies, and
 7 their elected representatives to advocate for the humane treatment of horses and other animals and
 8 the protection of the environment from horse slaughter contamination. These injuries will be
 9 redressed if the Plaintiffs prevail in this action, because when the grant of inspection is set aside,
 10 then horse slaughter cannot occur until proper NEPA review, including public participation and
 11 comment, is undertaken.

12 39. Plaintiff Horses for Life Foundation is a Bay Area organization dedicated to
 13 protecting horses who would otherwise go to slaughter or be captured, and preserving the wild
 14 ones that live on the American open range. Horses for Life advocates for an end to horse
 15 slaughter, and a ban on the export of American horses across international borders to slaughter.

16 40. Plaintiff Return to Freedom is a nonprofit organization with over 25,000
 17 supporters, headquartered in Lompoc, California, dedicated to the rescue of horses destined for
 18 slaughter, and wild horses. In 2007, Return to Freedom saved the lives of four horses who were
 19 about to be slaughtered at the Cavel slaughterhouse in DeKalb, Illinois. Return to Freedom
 20 brought these "miracle horses" to the Lompoc sanctuary, which became their permanent home.
 21 Return to Freedom and its supporters are devoted to these and other horses who have been
 22 obtained while en route to slaughter.

23 41. Return to Freedom's permanent equine residents include domestic and former wild
 24 horses who were on their way to slaughter but for the group's rescue of the horses, who now live
 25 permanently at the Return to Freedom ranch.

26 42. Return to Freedom supports the enactment of legislation that would end the
 27 slaughter of American horses for food, and the transport of horses for slaughter.

28

1 43. Return to Freedom has met with tribal Lakota elders, in an effort to prevent horse
 2 slaughter operations on tribal lands. After discussions, Return to Freedom obtained letters from
 3 the tribal elders stating their belief that horses should not be slaughtered for human food.

4 44. RTF has been a consultant as part of a feasibility study, for the State of New
 5 Mexico to provide rescue and sanctuary and save the wild horses on tribal and state lands from
 6 slaughter. Return to Freedom and its supporters remain heavily invested in ensuring that wild
 7 horses not be sent to slaughter.

8 45. Plaintiff Barbara Sink has lived in Gallatin, Missouri for nearly thirteen years. Her
 9 residence is located approximately three miles from the Rains Natural Meats facility. Ms. Sink
 10 was an engineer for the civil bioenvironmental engineering division of the United States Air
 11 Force for two years, a position that required her to survey and evaluate water quality in the
 12 workplace and surrounding environment, and recommend controls to keep environmental and
 13 occupational exposures within acceptable limits. She often spends time gardening and regularly
 14 fishes in the Grand River, which flows downstream from Rains Natural Meats, approximately one
 15 mile away. The stream adjacent to Rains Natural Meats flows directly into the Grand River.
 16 Ms. Sink often takes her children and grandchildren to the lakes, rivers, and streams that are local
 17 to Gallatin, Missouri to swim, hike, play, and fish.

18 46. Because of her knowledge of the potential contamination from horse slaughter
 19 operations, and the adulterated nature of horse meat, Ms. Sink will stop fishing in the Grand
 20 River, will stop eating fish that are locally caught, and will stop recreating at other local parks
 21 with her family if horse slaughter operations begin in Gallatin for fear of contamination from the
 22 Rains Natural Meat facility's runoff. This will cause her injury and distress.

23 47. Ms. Sink drives through Gallatin often, including past the Rains Natural Meat
 24 facility, to get to the Amish markets in Jamesport. If horse slaughter begins at Rains Natural
 25 Meat, she will see trucks with horses being carried to slaughter, which will cause her great
 26 distress, based on her understanding of the inherently cruel nature of horse slaughter.

27 48. If horse slaughter begins at Rains Natural Meats, Ms. Sink will also witness
 28 vehicles that are trucking away the remains and parts of horses which are being carried to

1 landfills, and the horse flesh being sold by Rains Natural Meats. Viewing these trucks will cause
 2 Ms. Sink injury and distress.

3 49. A livestock auction is located approximately three blocks from Ms. Sink's home,
 4 and if Rains Natural Meats begins slaughter operations, horses that are going to be slaughtered
 5 there will very likely pass through this livestock auction. Ms. Sink will see horses on their way to
 6 the auction, and then to slaughter at the Rains Natural Meats plant. This will cause her injury and
 7 distress.

8 50. Ms. Sink is aware that horse slaughterhouses that previously operated in the
 9 United States emitted a noxious odor. If Rains Natural Meats begins slaughtering horses, Ms.
 10 Sink will likely smell this stench when she is in town, which will detrimentally impact her ability
 11 to enjoy her life and her community.

12 51. Ms. Sink is extremely worried that if Rains Natural Meats begins slaughter
 13 operations, toxic runoff from the plant will pollute the surrounding area, including the rivers and
 14 streams near her home.

15 52. Plaintiff Krystle Smith has lived in Roswell, New Mexico for her entire life, and
 16 her mother and grandmother have lived in Roswell and southern New Mexico for all of their
 17 lives. Ms. Smith has been an employee of the Roswell Humane Society for seven years, and lives
 18 within six miles of the Valley Meat facility. She regularly spends time fishing and camping at
 19 Lake Van, which is downstream from Valley Meat, and which is connected to the waterways in
 20 proximity of Valley Meat by a series of underground channels that extend all the way to Carlsbad.
 21 She has been fishing and camping on Lake Van for years, and plans on continuing to do so, as
 22 long as the water and environment are not contaminated. However, the Pecos River, which is
 23 close to Valley Meat, runs through Roswell and surrounding towns including Hagerman, Artesia,
 24 and Carlsbad. A series of natural underground streams connect many of the waterways in the
 25 area downstream and in the vicinity of Valley Meat.

26 53. Based on Valley Meat's violations of New Mexico's and federal requirements
 27 regarding the protection of the environment and waterways, Ms. Smith is reasonably worried that
 28 any horse slaughter taking place at Valley Meat will affect the quality of the water in which

1 engages in regular recreation. This is compounded by Ms. Smith's reasonable belief that all
 2 horses who will be slaughtered at the Valley Meat facility have been given multiple drugs and
 3 other substances that render their meat adulterated and dangerous, so that the byproducts of
 4 Valley Meat's horse slaughter will pollute the surrounding area, including the rivers and streams.

5 54. If horse slaughter commences at Valley Meat, Ms. Smith will stop fishing and
 6 camping in the area she calls home, though she will desire to continue those activities. This will
 7 cause her injury and distress.

8 55. If Valley Meat begins a horse slaughter operation, Ms. Smith will be extremely
 9 worried about the discharges the horse slaughter facility is allowing to enter the local waterways,
 10 and she will be certain that the water in which she fishes is unsafe. She will not be able to eat fish
 11 from the river if Valley Meat is slaughtering horses.

12 56. Ms. Smith is aware that horse slaughter cannot be accomplished in a humane
 13 manner, and that horses suffer terribly in the slaughter process. As part of her job with the
 14 Roswell Humane Society, she travels to a nearby veterinary hospital no less than five times, and
 15 usually more times, each week. In order to get to that shelter she must drive right by where the
 16 Roswell Livestock Auction Barn is located. Any horses purchased by Valley Meat from the
 17 auction would be in plain view of the road she travels. If Valley Meat is slaughtering horses, she
 18 will be directly confronted with a view of the horses in holding pens and transport trucks waiting
 19 to be transported to Valley Meat for slaughter. These images will cause her intense aesthetic
 20 injury. Her aesthetic appreciation of the area will be harmed, she will be frightened to go past the
 21 facility, and she will have to be sure that her family does not go past the facility. If she sees
 22 horses being taken to Valley Meat, or trucks returning from there with carcasses, she will have an
 23 immediate and long-lasting injury from viewing those trucks and animals.

24 57. If livestock trucks carrying horses begin to drive past the Roswell Humane
 25 Society, Ms. Smith will be deeply affected because she will know that those horses are going to
 26 an inhumane death in the slaughterhouse, and because the offal and remains of those horses will
 27 pollute the ground around the facility and wherever else they are dropped, which could affect the
 28 entire community.

1 58. If Valley Meat begins slaughtering horses, the stench will carry into Roswell on a
 2 regular basis, especially with Roswell's intense summer heat and winds, and will seriously affect
 3 Ms. Smith's ability to enjoy her work, her life, and the surrounding parks and rivers and streams,
 4 which will all likely be affected by the contamination by Valley Meat from horse slaughter.

5 59. Plaintiff Ramona Cordova works in the Human Resources Department of Eastern
 6 New Mexico University's Roswell campus. She was born and raised in Roswell, and has lived
 7 there for almost all of her life. Her parents and much of her family, including her brother, aunts,
 8 uncles and cousins, all live in Roswell, and they are all proud of Roswell's reputation and
 9 community.

10 60. Ms. Cordova and her family are integrally connected to Roswell and its
 11 surrounding areas. A vital part of their sense of community and family structure comes from their
 12 love of the surrounding parks and lakes and natural structures in proximity to Roswell, and their
 13 ability to appreciate the town and the natural environment.

14 61. Ms. Cordova lives less than seven miles from the Valley Meat facility. She is
 15 active in gardening, walking around the Roswell community, and some hiking. She and her
 16 family go to the parks in proximity to the Valley Meat facility, including Bottomless Lakes State
 17 Park and others. Her family also engages in recreation and fishing on the Pecos River, which
 18 runs close to Valley Meat. They have been doing these activities for years and will continue to do
 19 them. A tributary of the Pecos River, the Spring River Canal, runs very close to Valley Meat and
 20 Ms. Cordova believes that runoff from Valley Meat drains into the Spring River Canal.

21 62. Ms. Cordova is aware that all horses who will be slaughtered at the Valley Meat
 22 facility have all been given multiple drugs and other substances that render their meat adulterated
 23 and dangerous, so that the byproducts of Valley Meat's horse slaughter will pollute the
 24 surrounding area, including the rivers and streams. Because of her patronage of these natural
 25 wonders, she will be injured and distressed by this damage.

26 63. Ms. Cordova understands that any method of horse slaughter will cause extreme
 27 and unnecessary pain and suffering for the horses involved. She regularly sees the trucks
 28 carrying cows and other animals to the local livestock auction. If she sees horses on their way to

1 the auction and then to slaughter at Valley Meat, her appreciation of her community and the
 2 proud nature of being a Roswell citizen will be immediately and permanently altered. If she sees
 3 horses being taken to Valley Meat, or trucks returning from there with their carcasses, she will
 4 have an immediate and long-lasting injury from viewing those trucks and animals.

5 64. Plaintiff Deborah Trahan has been a resident of Roswell, New Mexico for ten
 6 years, and lives within six miles of the Valley Meat slaughterhouse. She is disabled, and suffers
 7 from rheumatoid arthritis, osteoporosis and degenerative bone disease. Her autoimmune diseases
 8 are exacerbated by increases in stress and even subtle changes in diet.

9 65. Fish is an important part of Ms. Trahan's diet, and she believes the incorporation
 10 of fresh fish into her diet is important as a dietary treatment for all of three of her diseases. If
 11 Valley Meat begins slaughtering horses and discarding the byproducts of that process, she will no
 12 longer be able to eat the fish from local waterways, for fear of triggering an exacerbation of her
 13 diseases.

14 66. The natural beauty and healthy waterways in the area of Valley Meat are a vital
 15 part of Ms. Trahan's appreciation of the area. She is aware that Valley Meat has repeatedly
 16 violated New Mexico's and federal requirements regarding the protection of the environment and
 17 waterways, and reasonably believes Valley Meat will continue to do so once it begins
 18 slaughtering horses.

19 67. Ms. Trahan believes that all horses who will be slaughtered at the Valley Meat
 20 facility have been given multiple drugs and other substances that render their meat adulterated
 21 and dangerous, so that the byproducts of Valley Meat's horse slaughter will pollute the
 22 surrounding area, including the rivers and streams. A series of natural underground streams
 23 connect many of the waterways in the area downstream and in the vicinity of Valley Meat. If
 24 Valley Meat begins horse slaughter, she will be extremely worried about the discharges it is
 25 allowing to enter the local waterways.

26 68. Ms. Trahan's family does a significant amount of camping in the areas near Valley
 27 Meat. If Valley Meat begins slaughtering horses, she will stop camping in the area, even though
 28

1 she would want to continue, because she will be able to smell the Valley Meat facility and will be
 2 concerned that the water in the area was contaminated from the Valley Meat runoff.

3 69. Ms. Trahan believes that horse slaughter is inherently inhumane and that any
 4 method of horse slaughter will cause extreme and unnecessary pain and suffering for the horses
 5 involved. If she sees horses being taken to Valley Meat, or trucks returning from there with
 6 carcasses, she will have an immediate and long-lasting injury from viewing those trucks and
 7 animals.

8 70. Plaintiff Cassie Gross has been a resident of Roswell, New Mexico for thirty years.
 9 She has been employed by the Roswell Humane Society for twenty years, and lives within seven
 10 miles of Valley Meat.

11 71. Roswell has an international fame based on the reported sighting of UFOs in
 12 Roswell in 1947. It is home to the International UFO Museum and Research Center, and an
 13 annual Roswell UFO Festival that brings substantial income to the city. If people learn that
 14 Roswell is home to a horse slaughterhouse, she believes that tourism will be severely affected.
 15 Because of the negative sentiment about horse slaughter of a large majority of New Mexican
 16 citizens and all Americans, tourism will significantly drop this year and in future years, impacting
 17 many programs dependent on Roswell public funding.

18 72. If Valley Meat opens its slaughterhouse, tourism will significantly drop, and
 19 funding for the public schools where Ms. Gross' sons go, as well as other municipal privileges
 20 and benefits, will be reduced, injuring Ms. Gross and her family in a variety of ways.

21 73. If horse slaughter comes to Roswell, merchants will also lose significant income
 22 which comes in from tourists visiting Roswell all year long and especially for the Roswell UFO
 23 Festival, and will need to raise prices. This will cause Ms. Gross and the other plaintiffs
 24 economic harm based on the increased prices merchants will need to charge.

25 74. Ms. Gross is an organic gardener, and she fishes and camps with friends and
 26 family at Lake Van and on the Pecos River, which are close to Valley Meat. The natural beauty
 27 and healthy waterways in the area of Valley Meat are a vital part of her appreciation of the area,
 28 and she enjoys eating the fish she catches.

1 75. Because all horses who will be slaughtered at the Valley Meat facility have been
 2 given multiple drugs and other substances that render their meat adulterated and dangerous, the
 3 byproducts of Valley Meat's horse slaughter will pollute the surrounding area, including the
 4 rivers and streams, as well as the air quality in Roswell. This will cause aesthetic and recreational
 5 injury to Ms. Gross.

6 76. A series of natural underground streams connect many of the waterways in the
 7 area downstream and in the vicinity of Valley Meat. If Valley Meat begins horse slaughter, Ms.
 8 Gross will be extremely worried about the discharges it is allowing to enter the local waterways,
 9 and she will be certain that the water in which she fishes is unsafe. She will be further injured
 10 because she will not be able to eat fish from the river if Valley Meat is slaughtering horses, and
 11 she will stop camping in the area with her family.

12 77. Ms. Gross knows that horse slaughter is inherently inhumane and that any method
 13 of horse slaughter will cause extreme and unnecessary pain and suffering for the horses involved.
 14 As part of her job with the Roswell Humane Society, Ms. Gross travels to a nearby veterinary
 15 hospital no less than three times, and usually more times, each week. In order to get to that clinic,
 16 she must drive right by the Roswell Livestock Auction Barn, where any horses sold to Valley
 17 Meat will be trucked and temporarily kept. If Valley Meat is slaughtering horses, she will be
 18 directly confronted with the horror of the horses in holding pens waiting to be sent to Valley Meat
 19 to be slaughtered. She will be forced to see trucks loaded with horses, on their way to their death.
 20 These images will cause her intense and long-term aesthetic injury. She will be frightened to go
 21 past the facility, and will have to be sure that her children do not go past the facility.

22 78. If Valley Meat begins slaughtering horses, the stench from the plant will come
 23 over Ms. Gross's home on a daily basis, as winds from the South come into town consistently.
 24 The intense heat in the area will make the odors much worse and will seriously affect her ability
 25 to enjoy her work and her activities of daily life, and it will also ruin her ability to enjoy the
 26 surrounding parks and rivers and streams, which will all likely be affected by the contamination
 27 by Valley Meat from horse slaughter.

28

1 79. The interests of the individual Plaintiffs, of living in a clean community that does
 2 not depend on a water, air, or soil supply contaminated by horse slaughter's byproducts, are
 3 injured by Defendants' decision to grant inspection to a horse slaughter plant. The grant of
 4 inspection allows the horse slaughter plant to commence operations without any consideration of
 5 the environmental effects of the plant and without any information provided to or input received
 6 from the public and the local community regarding the significant environmental effects of horse
 7 slaughter. The individual plaintiffs' injuries are particularized because of their connection to the
 8 Roswell community and their physical proximity to the horse slaughter plant, and their viewing of
 9 the trucks carrying horses and their carcasses. NEPA is intended in part to protect persons who
 10 might be injured by major federal actions taken without proper regard for the possible
 11 environmental effects of such actions. The individual Plaintiffs are just the type of people whom
 12 NEPA procedural requirements are intended to assist.

13 80. These injuries are caused by the USDA's grant of inspection to horse
 14 slaughterhouses in the United States and adoption of the new residue testing plan for horse
 15 slaughter, because if the grant of inspection had not been given and a new testing program had
 16 not been adopted, horses would not and legally could not be slaughtered for human consumption
 17 in America.

18 81. Plaintiffs' injuries will be redressed if the Plaintiffs prevail in this action, because
 19 when the grant of inspection is set aside, the horse slaughter plant will be prohibited from
 20 operating and causing harmful environmental effects in local communities unless proper
 21 precautions have been taken. Furthermore, Plaintiffs will have the opportunity to present their
 22 concerns about the immediate harmful environmental effects of horse slaughter plants to the
 23 USDA at the time that USDA engages in the required NEPA review.

24 82. Defendant Tom Vilsack is the Secretary of Agriculture, and has ultimate
 25 responsibility for ensuring that agencies within USDA comply with requirements of the APA and
 26 NEPA and with its own regulations.

27 83. Defendant Elizabeth A. Hagen is the USDA Under Secretary for Food Safety, and
 28 is responsible for overseeing FSIS, the public agency in USDA responsible for ensuring the

1 nation's meat is safe. Defendant Hagen has ultimate responsibility for ensuring that FSIS
 2 complies with requirements of the APA and NEPA and with its own regulations.

3 84. Defendant Alfred V. Almanza is the Administrator of FSIS, an agency within
 4 USDA, and is responsible for authorizing the grant of inspection to horse slaughter facilities
 5 challenged in this case. Defendant Almanza has ultimate responsibility for ensuring that FSIS
 6 complies with the requirements of the APA and NEPA and with its own regulations.

7 **IV. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK UNDERLYING THE COMPLAINT**

8 **A. Administrative Procedure Act.**

9 85. The Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 551 *et seq.* ("APA"), provides that
 10 "[a] person suffering legal wrong because of agency action, or adversely affected or aggrieved by
 11 agency action within the meaning of a relevant statute, is entitled to judicial review thereof." 5
 12 U.S.C. § 702.

13 86. "[F]inal agency action for which there is no other adequate remedy in a court" is
 14 subject to judicial review. 5 U.S.C. § 704.

15 87. Under the APA, a reviewing court shall "hold unlawful and set aside agency
 16 action, findings, and conclusions found to be . . . arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or
 17 otherwise not in accordance with law; . . . in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or
 18 limitations, or short of statutory right; [or] without observance of procedure required by law." 5
 19 U.S.C. §§ 706(2)(A), (C), and (D).

20 **B. National Environmental Policy Act.**

21 88. The National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.* (NEPA), and the
 22 Council for Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations, 40 C.F.R. parts 1500-1508, require
 23 federal agencies to conduct environmental impact analyses for regulatory actions.

24 89. NEPA is the "basic national charter for protection of the environment." 40 C.F.R.
 25 § 1500.1(a). NEPA's purpose encompasses "[promoting] efforts which will prevent or eliminate
 26 damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man" and
 27 "[establishing] a Council on Environmental Quality." 42 U.S.C. § 4321.

28

1 90. In enacting NEPA, Congress “recogniz[ed] the profound impact of man’s activity
 2 on the interrelations of all components of the natural environment, particularly the profound
 3 influences of population growth, high-density urbanization, industrial expansion, resource
 4 exploitation, and new and expanding technological advances[.]” 42 U.S.C. § 4331.

5 91. The goals of NEPA reflect “the continuing policy of the Federal Government . . .
 6 and other concerned public and private organizations, to use all practicable means and
 7 measures . . . in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and
 8 maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the
 9 social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans.” *Id.*

10 92. The Council on Environmental Quality (“CEQ”) established by NEPA is charged
 11 with “formulat[ing] and recommend[ing] national policies to promote the improvement of the
 12 quality of the environment.” 42 U.S.C. § 4342.

13 93. The USDA has expressly “incorporate[d] and adopt[ed]” all of the CEQ
 14 regulations. 7 C.F.R. § 1b.1(a).

15 94. The CEQ regulations implementing NEPA mandate that “[f]ederal agencies shall
 16 to the fullest extent possible . . . [u]se the NEPA process to identify and assess the reasonable
 17 alternatives to proposed actions that will avoid or minimize adverse effects . . . upon the quality
 18 of the human environment,” and “[u]se all practicable means . . . to restore and enhance the
 19 quality of the human environment and avoid or minimize any possible adverse effects of their
 20 actions upon the quality of the human environment.” 40 C.F.R. §§ 1500.2(a), (f).

21 95. CEQ regulations instruct the USDA to “integrate the NEPA process with other
 22 planning at the earliest possible time to insure that planning and decisions reflect environmental
 23 values, to avoid delays later in the process, and to head off potential conflicts.” 40 C.F.R.
 24 § 1501.2.

25 96. Where an agency is invoking a new inspection mechanism, NEPA review is
 26 required before that mechanism can be invoked. “NEPA procedures must insure that
 27 environmental information is available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made
 28 and before actions are taken.” 40 C.F.R. § 1500.1(b).

1 97. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia has previously
 2 decided that a change in the “legal or regulatory status quo” triggers NEPA review. *Johanns*, 520
 3 F. Supp. 2d at 29. NEPA requires that a federal agency prepare one of three levels of
 4 documentation based on the significance of its project's possible impact on the environment. *See*
 5 40 C.F.R. § 1507.3(b).

6 98. NEPA requires all federal agencies to prepare a “detailed statement” regarding all
 7 “major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.” 42 U.S.C.
 8 § 4332(C). This statement is referred to as the Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”).

9 99. CEQ has issued regulations defining the term “major federal action.” In particular,
 10 40 C.F.R. § 1508.18 provides that:

11 ‘Major Federal action’ includes actions with effects that may be major and which
 12 are potentially subject to Federal control and responsibility . . . (a) Actions include
 13 new and continuing activities, including projects and programs entirely or partly
 14 financed, assisted, conducted, regulated, or approved by federal agencies; new or
 15 revised agency rules, regulations, plans, policies, or procedures; and legislative
 16 proposals. . . .

17 40 C.F.R. § 1508.18.

18 100. One common category of federal action is “[a]pproval of specific projects, such as
 19 construction or management activities located in a defined geographic area. Projects include
 20 actions approved by permit or other regulatory decision as well as federal and federally assisted
 21 activities.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.18(b)(4).

22 101. CEQ regulations explain that evaluation of the term “significantly” in 42 U.S.C.
 23 § 4332(C) requires considerations of both “context” and “intensity”. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27. For
 24 context, the agency must consider the effects on society as a whole, the affected region, the
 25 affected interests, and the locality. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(a). For intensity, meaning the severity of
 26 the environmental impact, the agency must take into account multiple considerations, among
 27 them: the degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety; the degree to which
 28 the effects on the environment are likely to be highly controversial; the “degree to which the
 29 possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown
 30 risks”; the degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant

1 effects; and “[w]hether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or
 2 requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b).

3 102. An EIS must describe:

4 (i) the environmental impact of the proposed action, (ii) any adverse
 5 environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be
 6 implemented, (iii) alternatives to the proposed action, (iv) the relationship
 7 between local short-term uses of man’s environment and the maintenance and
 enhancement of long-term productivity, and (v) any irreversible and irretrievable
 commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action
 should it be implemented.

8 42 U.S.C. § 4332(C).

9 103. “Effect” is defined in CEQ regulations to encompass both direct and indirect
 10 effects and impacts, including but not limited to ecological, aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic,
 11 social, or health effects, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.8.

12 104. Projects that “do not individually or cumulatively have a significant environmental
 13 effect” may proceed under a “categorical exclusion” from NEPA review, in which case neither an
 14 EIS nor an environmental assessment (“EA”) is required. However, the agency’s procedures for
 15 determining categorical exclusions must provide for extraordinary circumstances in which a
 16 normally excluded action has or may have a significant environmental effect. *See* 40 C.F.R.
 17 §§ 1508.4, 1507.3(b)(2)(ii).

18 105. USDA regulations implementing NEPA state that FSIS is excluded from the
 19 requirements of preparing procedures to implement NEPA and is “categorically excluded from
 20 the preparation of an EA or EIS unless the agency head determines that an action may have a
 21 significant environmental effect.” 7 C.F.R. §§ 1b.4(a) and 1b.4(b)(6).

22 106. Thus, if the agency finds that its proposed action could potentially be covered by a
 23 categorical exclusion, the agency must determine whether there are any “[e]xtraordinary
 24 circumstances” that nevertheless require the agency to perform an environmental evaluation
 25 because the action “may have a significant environmental effect.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.4.

26 107. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia has found that USDA
 27 violated CEQ regulations when it failed even to consider whether a normally excluded action,
 28

1 such as an FSIS action, may have a significant environmental impact. *Johanns*, 520 F. Supp. 2d
 2 at 34.

3 108. Furthermore, according to USDA's own regulations, any agency of the USDA,
 4 including FSIS, is required to "continue to scrutinize [its] activities to determine continued
 5 eligibility for categorical exclusion." 7 C.F.R. §§ 1b.3(a), (c), and 1b.4.

6 109. If the agency has not determined that its action "[n]ormally requires an
 7 environmental impact statement," or normally is covered by a categorical exclusion, then the
 8 agency must prepare an EA to determine whether the agency must prepare a full EIS or issue a
 9 finding of "no significant impact" on the environment (FONSI). 40 C.F.R. §§ 1501.4, 1508.9,
 10 1508.13.

11 C. **Federal Meat Inspection Act ("FMIA").**

12 110. The Federal Meat Inspection Act, 21 U.S.C. § 601 *et seq.* ("FMIA"), is a
 13 comprehensive statutory meat inspection scheme, and slaughter facilities cannot operate without
 14 federal oversight, inspection, and approval by FSIS. A new horse slaughter facility requires the
 15 grant of inspection and continued inspection and oversight by USDA. *See* 21 U.S.C. § 603(a).

16 111. Federal inspection is required at any facility slaughtering horses or other animals
 17 intended for use as human food. 9 C.F.R. §§ 302.1, 304.1.

18 112. In order to be eligible for federal inspection pursuant to the FMIA, a horse
 19 slaughter facility must apply to FSIS for inspection, and review of any application for inspection
 20 necessarily involves FSIS assessing detailed paperwork regarding the premises, standard
 21 operating procedures, and management of waste-streams, including sewage and water. 9 C.F.R.
 22 § 416.2.

23 V. **FACTS GIVING RISE TO PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

24 A. **Horse Slaughter in America**

25 113. Americans have a long relationship with horses. We keep horses as companions.
 26 They have stood by, loyal as dogs, during every war from the American Revolution up to the
 27 present day. They shoulder the burdens to work for farmers and ranchers. We admire their
 28 wildness and herd cultures where they are left alone in nature on the open range. There are

1 approximately nine million horses and two million horse owners in the U.S., and in addition there
 2 are tens of thousands of wild horses in this country. In New Mexico, the location of Valley
 3 Meat's horse slaughter plant, there are 147,000 horses, over 60 percent of which are involved in
 4 showing and recreation.

5 114. Americans do not intend their horses to end up as meat, and American captive and
 6 wild horses are not treated by their original owners as food animals. Because they are not raised
 7 in regulated industries conscious of public health and safety concerns, but rather in private homes,
 8 on racetracks, and as working animals, serious environmental issues arise if they are slaughtered
 9 for human food. Almost all American horses are given a wide variety of drugs and other
 10 substances that render their blood and tissue contaminated and dangerous to consume. The
 11 discard of the byproducts of horse slaughter thus poses serious public health risks when such
 12 adulterated tissue and blood, and the wastewater from slaughter, seep into the ground and water
 13 supply.

14 115. According to a recent objective survey, approximately eighty percent of
 15 Americans surveyed are opposed to horse slaughter for human consumption. Polls in New
 16 Mexico, Iowa and Missouri have established that seventy percent of the voters in each of those
 17 states are similarly opposed to the practice. Nevertheless, every year more than 140,000
 18 American horses are sold to slaughter.

19 116. Horses are sent to slaughterhouses in deplorable, inhumane, and cruel conditions,
 20 because long-distance transport in cramped trucks is especially difficult for horses.

21 117. The treatment of horses at slaughterhouses in America (in the past) and abroad has
 22 been roundly criticized. Defendants FSIS and USDA have documented appalling cruelty at U.S.
 23 horse slaughter plants, including gruesome descriptions and photographs of the mistreatment
 24 inherent in horse slaughter.⁴

25 4 See, e.g., USDA, Food Safety & Inspection Service, Noncompliance Record No. 0019-2005-
 26 8243 (Apr. 13, 2005); see also, e.g., Noncompliance Record Nos. 00 18-2005-8243 (Apr. 4,
 27 2005) ("Nine horses were overcrowded in the alleyway causing undue excitement which was
 28 further exacerbated when two more employees from the kill floor began yelling and hitting these
 horses causing the one in the end of the line to slip and fall."); 0013-2006-8243 (Oct. 9, 2006)
 ("horse was down" . . . "in the upper middle compartment of a pot bellied trailer" and "[o]ther
 (Footnote continued on next page)

1 118. Horse slaughter is particularly detrimental to the human environment. The last
 2 three American horse slaughterhouses, located in DeKalb, Illinois (Cavel), Kaufman, Texas
 3 (Dallas Crown), and Fort Worth, Texas (Beltex), were shut down in 2007. Every one of these
 4 operations wreaked environmental havoc by dumping blood, entrails, urine, feces, heads, and
 5 hooves into local water systems, overwhelming local waste water infrastructures and causing
 6 numerous environmental violations.

7 119. According to the former mayor of Kaufman, Texas, where the Dallas Crown plant
 8 was located, the problems were epidemic, including significant environmental contamination.
 9 Dallas Crown also left a 600-gallon container filled with blood and horse parts outside its facility,
 10 which generated a stench, attracted flies and vermin, and eventually spilled outside the plant,
 11 emptying horse blood into the ground.

12 120. The environmental contamination caused by that horse slaughter plant was in no
 13 way confined to contamination at the facility itself. In fact, on multiple occasions, Kaufman
 14 residents' faucets delivered blood and horse tissue instead of water. Dallas Crown's
 15 environmental contamination and repeated local wastewater code violations imposed
 16 environmental, aesthetic, public health, and economic harms on its host community.

17 121. As exemplified by the operations of the horse slaughter plants closed down in the
 18 U.S. six years ago, horse slaughter produces environmental effects on a magnitude not seen with
 19 other slaughter facilities, and causes potentially serious environmental harms for any local
 20 community hosting a horse slaughter facility. Individuals living near any horse slaughter plant
 21 will suffer degradation in the quality of their air, water, and ground resources. This is because
 22
 23

24 (Footnote continued from previous page)
 25 horses within the compartment were trampling the downed horse"); 0006-2007-8243 (Jan. 24,
 26 2007)) ("two downed horses being trampled upon by the other horses as well as the front horse
 27 being kicked with the hind feet from another horse"); Press Release, Animals' Angels (Nov.
 28 2008), available at <http://www.kaufmanzoning.net/nov24/pressrelease.pdf>; see also Mary Nash's
 Horse Meat Website, available at <http://www.kaufmanzoning.net/foia.htm> (making available for
 download USDA documents describing and depicting regulatory violations, mistreatment, and
 cruelty).

1 horses are different, as previously stated, in the way they are raised and the dangerous drugs and
 2 medications with which they are treated.

3 122. The disposal of horse blood and offal presents a particular environmental threat
 4 because of the drugs and substances horses are given throughout their lives. The byproducts of
 5 horse slaughter – especially blood, sludge, and waste water –may contaminate groundwater and
 6 even enter the food chain when sludge is distributed on crops. For that reason, horse slaughter
 7 involves effects on the environment that are “highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown
 8 risks” because it is unknown how those drug residues, once in the local water or ground supply,
 9 will affect the health and safety of nearby residents.

10 123. Because USDA is approving a horse slaughter facility for the first time since the
 11 last horse slaughterhouses were shut down in 2007, the manner in which USDA approves a grant
 12 of inspection for a domestic horse slaughter plant, including whether it undertakes NEPA review,
 13 will likely establish a precedent for how the agency handles future slaughter inspection
 14 applications.

15 124. Horse slaughter’s impacts on local, national and even international human
 16 environments is highly controversial, as evidenced by the large percentage of Americans opposed
 17 to horse slaughter, the introduction and support of federal legislation that would prohibit horse
 18 slaughter for human consumption, and the recent scandal regarding the incorporation of horse
 19 meat into beef products throughout Europe.

20 125. Approval of horse slaughter inspections threatens a violation of Federal, State, and
 21 local environmental laws, because past horse slaughter facilities repeatedly and brazenly violated
 22 local laws pertaining to waste management and air and water quality, costing host communities
 23 large sums of money to seek compliance and remedy environmental harms, and because of the
 24 special dangers inherent in horse meat.

25 126. By reestablishing horse slaughter in New Mexico – or anywhere else – USDA’s
 26 new program of inspection will have known and unknown effects on the ecology of local
 27 communities, and on the aesthetic, economic, social and health interests of people and their
 28 environment.

1 127. All of the environmental effects caused by horse slaughter only occur if USDA's
 2 grant of an application for inspection to a horse slaughter plant is allowed to move forward.

3 128. Defendants have never refuted that "horse slaughter operations have 'significantly'
 4 impacted the environment within the meaning of NEPA as set forth in 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27."
 5 *Johanns*, 520 F. Supp. 2d at 19.

6 129. USDA has publicly stated that it believes no NEPA review is required before
 7 granting inspection of domestic horse slaughter facilities.

8 130. In determining whether NEPA review was necessary before allowing a new horse
 9 slaughter plan and set of policies, USDA was confronted with compelling evidence that all of the
 10 last three horse slaughterhouses operating in this country wreaked environmental havoc on their
 11 local communities. USDA has allowed domestic horse slaughter for human consumption to
 12 resume in this country, presumably without any FSIS consideration or scrutiny to determine
 13 whether the issuance of these grants of inspection were eligible for a categorical exclusion from
 14 NEPA requirements.

15 B. The Federal Regulation of Horse Slaughter

16 131. Until 2006, FSIS carried out inspections of horse slaughter plants. In an
 17 amendment to the 2006 Agricultural Appropriations Act, on November 10, 2005, Congress
 18 withdrew funding for the inspection of horses transported for slaughter, and the inspection of
 19 horse slaughterhouses. Pub. L. 109-97, § 794, 119 Stat. 2120, 2164 (A.R. 51). The funding
 20 prohibition was reinstated annually through 2011, confirming its intended effect of prohibiting
 21 nationwide the slaughter of horses for meat. *See* Remarks of Senator John Ensign (R-NV), 151
 22 CONG. REC. S 10,218 (Sep. 20, 2005) ("The goal of our amendment is simple: to end the
 23 slaughter of America's horses for human consumption overseas.").

24 132. After the President signed the 2006 appropriations amendment into law, the three
 25 horse slaughter plants operating in the U.S. filed a petition with the USDA for emergency
 26 rulemaking to create a fee-for-service inspection regime, whereby the slaughterhouses would pay
 27 for FSIS inspectors to oversee their continued operations. USDA granted that petition without

1 any public notice or comment and against the express intent of Congress. *See Johanns*, 520 F.
 2 Supp. 2d at 12-13.

3 133. The HSUS and other parties filed a complaint with the United States District Court
 4 of the District of Columbia claiming that USDA's implementation of this rule, which would have
 5 allowed horse slaughter to continue without performing a NEPA analysis, was a violation of
 6 NEPA. On the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment, the court ruled that the USDA's
 7 interpretation of 7 C.F.R. § 1b.4 as permitting FSIS to ignore whether its actions have
 8 environmental impacts was arbitrary and capricious, and thus a violation of the APA. *Johanns*,
 9 520 F. Supp. 2d 8, 36. The Court stated that "any notion that USDA may avoid NEPA review
 10 simply by *failing* even to consider whether a normally excluded action may have a significant
 11 environmental impact flies in the face of the CEQ regulations." *Id.* at 34 (internal quotation
 12 omitted).

13 134. In November 2011, Congress failed to renew the ban on funding federal FSIS
 14 inspectors at horse slaughter plants in the United States. Presently, FSIS has appropriations to
 15 conduct horse slaughter plant inspections.

16 135. In response to the appropriations by Congress for horse slaughter inspections, and
 17 because of the great threat to human health associated with the consumption of meat from
 18 American horses, Plaintiffs FRER and HSUS filed two petitions for rulemaking, requesting the
 19 USDA and the Food and Drug Administration to recognize the potential dangers of horsemeat
 20 and to issue rules in connection with those dangers. *See* footnotes 1, 2, *supra*.

21 136. During the time that FSIS considered and approved the applications for inspection
 22 to slaughter horses throughout the United States, USDA had for its consideration Plaintiffs' April
 23 2012 rulemaking petition that underscored for USDA the serious health risks and environmental
 24 harms inherent in permitting horse slaughter plants to operate in the United States. USDA has not
 25 acted on the rulemaking petition Plaintiffs filed, but it has stated that in order to begin horse
 26 slaughter again, the agency would need to develop new protocols, policies and procedures in
 27 order to comply with the FMIA and provide inspections of horse slaughter plants.

28

1 137. Plaintiffs have provided USDA with undisputed evidence that virtually every
 2 American horse who goes to slaughter has received medications that federal law specifically
 3 states are not to be used on animals intended to be eaten. Thus, USDA must come up with a new
 4 plan or policy that addresses the fact that every American horse is potentially excluded from the
 5 food supply as a matter of law.

6 138. The rulemaking petition also provided USDA with ample evidence demonstrating
 7 the inevitable environmental effects of the agency's action if the agency were to proceed by
 8 granting an inspection to a horse slaughter facility.

9 139. On June 28, 2013, USDA denied FRER's and HSUS' rulemaking petition, and
 10 issued a grant of inspection for Valley Meat, announced that it would be granting inspection to
 11 horse slaughter facilities in Iowa and Missouri, so that the companies could begin slaughtering
 12 horses for human consumption.

13 140. Defendants are aware of Valley Meat's past noncompliance with environmental
 14 regulations. When Valley Meat was in the business of slaughtering cattle, FSIS documented
 15 maggot-infested piles of decaying animals as high as fifteen feet on its property.⁵ FSIS itself first
 16 noted Valley Meat's gross violations of waste removal requirements for its cattle slaughter
 17 operations. USDA has taken the final agency action of granting inspection to Valley Meat,
 18 conditionally authorizing it to slaughter horses, despite Valley Meat's past problems processing
 19 cattle, and despite the obvious environmental and health effects associated with horse slaughter.

20 141. Given its history of environmental violations, Valley Meat's operations, as well as
 21 other horse slaughter plant's operations, should be subjected to heightened environmental
 22 scrutiny. However, USDA has granted and says it will grant permits of inspection to engage in
 23 horse slaughter without engaging in such scrutiny.

24 142. USDA possessed information that was directly relevant to the grant of inspection
 25 to domestic horse slaughter plants. While Defendants have not made their decision documents
 26

27 28

⁵ January 22, 2010 Letter from Dr. Ron Nelson, Denver District Manager, FSIS to the Roswell
 Health Office of the New Mexico Health Department.

1 available at this time, this information presumably was not a part of the agency's decision of
 2 whether a grant of inspection to a horse slaughter facility was subject to NEPA's review
 3 requirements.

4 143. USDA has stated that it needed to develop new drug residue testing plans, plans
 5 and policies in connection with the renewal of horse slaughter in America. USDA will need to
 6 provide new training to its inspectors in order to begin horse slaughter operations again.

7 144. Defendants have now adopted a fatally flawed new residue testing plan,
 8 specifically for horse slaughter, that will govern all horse slaughter operations in the country.
 9 Defendants presumably did not conduct any environmental review prior to adopting and
 10 implementing this new testing program.

11 145. Because of the grant of inspection to domestic horse slaughter plants and the
 12 adoption of a new drug residue testing plan for regulating horse slaughter nationwide, the status
 13 quo of no domestic horse slaughter has ended, and the slaughter of American horses for human
 14 consumption is now resuming for the first time in this country since 2007.

15 146. By granting inspection to a horse slaughter plant and by adopting a new residue
 16 testing plan to apply to horse slaughter nationwide, USDA has substantively changed its
 17 operations by allocating its finite resources to authorize and oversee horse slaughter. This is a
 18 major change in policy and practice that has direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on the
 19 environment.

20 147. The grant of inspection to a horse slaughter facility creates a significant change in
 21 the status quo because without it, horse slaughterhouses could not legally operate.

22 148. In addition to the domestic change in status quo from a practical prohibition on
 23 horse slaughter since 2006 to now USDA issuing a grant of inspection to domestic horse
 24 slaughterhouses, relevant international regulations of horse meat have also changed. The
 25 European Union (EU) adopted in 2009 new regulations that will require any imported horse meat
 26 to satisfy additional and higher export safety and inspection requirements.

27 149. USDA has not incorporated any change in policy or inspection requirements to
 28 address the adopted EU regulations. Horses slaughtered in the U.S. are exported to EU markets,

1 and U.S. horse meat will have to satisfy these new EU regulations. Because there has been no
 2 horse slaughter in the U.S. since these regulations were adopted, USDA did not have to worry
 3 about whether its inspections complied with EU regulations. If American horse slaughter starts
 4 up again pursuant to FSIS's grant of inspection, there is a new regulatory framework in place, and
 5 USDA needs to revise its inspection procedures to comply with it. This is an additional change in
 6 the status quo triggering the requirements of NEPA.

7 150. In response to the prospect of resuming horse slaughter operations in the United
 8 States and in response to public opposition to American horse slaughter, Congress is considering
 9 a bipartisan bill, the Safeguard American Food Exports (SAFE) Act, that would prohibit U.S.
 10 horse slaughter facilities and also ban the exporting of horses for slaughter. S. 541/H.R. 1094.

11 151. In response to the Obama Administration eliminating funding for USDA
 12 inspection of horse slaughter facilities in its proposed budget for FY2014, both the House and
 13 Senate Appropriations committees unanimously amended the FY2014 Agriculture Appropriations
 14 bill to eliminate funding for the inspection of horse slaughter facilities.

15 152. Recent events overseas have also emphasized the dangers of horse slaughter.
 16 Horse meat has been found in many samples of beef in several European countries. Recalls
 17 because of the horse meat problem were reported on a regular basis for weeks in 2013. For
 18 example, furniture (and meat) company IKEA removed 1670 pounds of meatballs from fourteen
 19 countries across the European continent. Horse meat in beef products in Ireland and England
 20 raised great concerns as well. The potential for contamination of beef products with the drugs
 21 and other substances associated with horse slaughter, as well as the effects on the human
 22 environment, are a reality overseas.

23 153. USDA officials have stated that Americans did not have to worry about toxic horse
 24 meat in their beef, for the specific reason that there was no horsemeat being produced in America.
 25 This is a virtual admission by USDA that, if production of horse meat begins in America, there
 26 will be a significant effect on the human environment, and a potential contamination of the
 27 American meat supply.

28

1 C. The Effect of Horse Slaughter on Endangered Species

2 154. The horse slaughtering process produces by-products and waste products that are a
 3 threat to the environment and to wildlife in the vicinity of the slaughter facility. Horse
 4 slaughtering produces the following: (1) manure, contents of rumen and intestines; (2) edible
 5 products, including offal and blood; (3) inedible products such as bones, and hair; (4) fat; and
 6 (5) large volumes of wastewater.

7 155. Most slaughterhouse processes require the use of water, and the pollutants
 8 contained in wastewater can impact the environment when the wastewater runoff enters into
 9 groundwater, streams, and rivers. Horse slaughtering also requires large amounts of hot water
 10 and steam for sterilizing and cleaning. Generating the energy for heating water emits gasses,
 11 which contribute to air pollution.

12 156. Horse slaughter facilities, with their combination of contaminated by-products and
 13 excessive steam generation and the need to discharge massive amounts of wastewater, represent a
 14 threat to the environment as well as threatened and endangered species in the area. For example,
 15 Valley Meat is located near South Spring River, Pecos River, Bitter Lake Wildlife Refuge, and
 16 Bottomless Lakes State Park. Threatened and endangered species are found within the vicinity of
 17 Valley Meat, and their continued existence may be jeopardized by the horse slaughtering
 18 activities. Valley Meat's operations may also adversely affect or destroy the habitats of the
 19 threatened and endangered species. Affected species may include, but are not limited to, the
 20 Pecos bluntnose shiner, the Least tern, the Pecos Assiminea snail, Koster's springsnail, Roswell
 21 springsnail (collectively "snails"), and Noel's Amphipod.

22 157. The Least tern is a bird listed as endangered by FWS. The tern's breeding area is
 23 in the Bitter Lake refuge and some breeding may occur at the Bottomless Lakes. The tern and its
 24 habitat, both Bitter Lake and the Bottomless Lakes, could be impacted by air emissions and
 25 wastewater from the slaughterhouse.

26 158. The Pecos bluntnose shiner is a fish listed as threatened by FWS. In 2006, the
 27 FWS New Mexico Ecological Services Field Office issued a 5-year review of the shiner stating
 28 that the shiner's habitat is in the Pecos River—from the Fort Sumner Irrigation District Diversion

1 Dam to Brantley Reservoir—and has been found near Valley Meat's location. FWS has issued a
 2 final rule designating as a critical habitat for the shiner large portions of the Pecos River, located
 3 both upstream and downstream from Valley Meat's location. The shiner and its critical habitat
 4 may be adversely affected by the introduction of wastewater from the slaughterhouse into the
 5 waterways.

6 159. Additionally, the snails and Noel's Amphipod may be affected by Valley Meat's
 7 activities. FWS issued a final rule designating critical habitat for the snails and Noel's
 8 Amphipod. The designated critical habitats are in close proximity to Valley Meat and are within
 9 Bitter Lake refuge and part of the Pecos River. The snails and Noel's Amphipod, and their
 10 critical habitats, may be adversely affected by any wastewater or air emissions.

11 160. Similar threats to threatened and endangered species likely exist in the proximity
 12 of other potential domestic horse slaughter facilities. Given the complexity of the environmental
 13 impacts of wastewater discharge, USDA should have completed a comprehensive consultation
 14 under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2), before granting any
 15 application for inspection at a domestic horse slaughter facility, and any operation has a potential
 16 significant impact on the human environment.

17 **VI. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

18 **A. Claim One: Violation of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C.**
 19 **§ 4332(C).**

20 161. Plaintiffs hereby restate and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in
 21 this Complaint.

22 162. By granting inspection to a horse slaughter facility without first conducting an
 23 environmental review and producing an EIS according to NEPA, 42 U.S.C. § 4332(C), USDA
 24 has violated NEPA and CEQ's implementing regulations, and has acted arbitrarily and
 25 capriciously, and without observance of procedure required by law, in violation of the
 26 Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 706(2) *et seq.*

27 163. Defendants' conduct is the legal and factual cause of Plaintiffs' injuries alleged in
 28 this Complaint.

1 **B. Claim Two: Violation of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C.**
 2 **§ 4332(C).**

3 164. Plaintiffs hereby restate and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in
 4 this Complaint.

5 165. By establishing, issuing and authorizing a drug residue testing plan for horse
 6 slaughter to be used at horse slaughter facilities without first conducting an environmental review
 7 and producing an EIS according to NEPA, 42 U.S.C. § 4332(C), USDA has violated NEPA and
 8 CEQ's implementing regulations, and has acted arbitrarily and capriciously, and without
 9 observance of procedure required by law, in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5
 10 U.S.C. §§ 706(2) *et seq.*

11 166. Defendants' conduct is the legal and factual cause of Plaintiffs' injuries alleged in
 12 this Complaint.

13 **C. Claim Three: Violation of The Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706**

14 167. Plaintiffs hereby restate and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in
 15 this Complaint.

16 168. By providing a grant of inspection to domestic horse slaughter plants, USDA has
 17 abused its discretion and acted arbitrarily and capriciously and not in accordance with law, in
 18 violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 706(2)(A), (C), and (D).

19 169. Defendants' conduct is the legal and factual cause of Plaintiffs' injuries alleged in
 20 this Complaint.

21 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request that the Court issue an Order:

22 1. Declaring that USDA's grant of inspection to a horse slaughter facility without the
 23 required NEPA review is arbitrary and capricious, and without observance of procedure required
 24 by law, and not in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act or the National
 25 Environmental Policy Act;

26 2. Declaring that USDA's establishment of a drug residue testing plan for horse
 27 slaughter without NEPA review is arbitrary and capricious, and without observance of procedure

1 required by law, and not in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act or the National
2 Environmental Policy Act;

3 3. Setting aside any grants of inspection given to horse slaughter plants throughout
4 the United States;

5 4. Preliminarily and permanently enjoining USDA or FSIS from granting or
6 conditionally granting any applications for inspection of horse slaughter facilities, and from
7 otherwise carrying out any inspections of horse slaughter facilities, without the performance of
8 adequate NEPA review;

9 5. Preliminarily and permanently enjoining USDA or FSIS from implementing the
10 new drug residue testing plan for horse slaughterhouses nationwide, without the performance of
11 adequate NEPA review;

12 6. Awarding Plaintiffs costs and reasonable attorneys' fees' and

13 7. Awarding Plaintiffs any other relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

14
15 Date: July 1, 2013

SCHIFF HARDIN LLP

16
17 By:

18 
Bruce A. Wagman, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs